



2682
PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
(Case No. 1461)

In re the Application of:

Anthony Sabatino

Serial No. 09/597,530

Filed: June 20, 2000

For: AIRCRAFT WIRELESS
COMMUNICATION SYSTEM AND
METHOD

Confirmation No. 5976

Art Unit: 2682

RECEIVED

MAY 01 2003

Technology Center 2600

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Sir:

TRANSMITTAL LETTER

In regard to the above identified application:

1. We are transmitting herewith the attached:
 - a. Response to Office Action Mailed January 23, 2003
 - b. Return Receipt Postcard.
2. With respect to additional fees
3. Please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 210765. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.
4. CERTIFICATE OF MAILING UNDER 37 CFR § 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this Transmittal Letter and the paper, as described in paragraph 1 hereinabove, are being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 on this 23rd day of April, 2003.

By:



Marcus J. Thymian
Reg. No. 43,954



#7
LB
S-1-23

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
(Docket No. 1461)

PATENT

In re the Application of:

Anthony Sabatino

Filing Date: June 20, 2000

Serial No.: 09/597,530

For: AIRCRAFT WIRELESS
COMMUNICATION SYSTEM AND
METHOD

Examiner: Nghi H. Ly

Group Art Unit 2682

RECEIVED
MAY 01 2003
Technology Center 2600

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria
Virginia 22313-1450

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION MAILED JANUARY 23, 2003

Dear Sir:

In response to the Office Action mailed January 23, 2003, Applicant submits the following remarks.

Remarks

Claims 1-24 are pending. In the Office Action mailed January 23, 2003, the Examiner rejected all the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) under various combinations of Corbefin et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,269,243), Sinivaara (U.S. Pat. No. 6,055,425), Powell (U.S. Pat. No. 4,916,460), Bickel et al. (3,680,115), Mashida (JP408167786A), and Hodge et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,029,958). Because a combination of Corbefin et al. with Sinivaara served as the foundation for each claim rejection, Applicant will focus on these two patents. As will be illustrated in the following discussion, the combination of Corbefin et al. with Sinivaara fails to disclose or suggest all of the elements of the claimed invention. Furthermore, such a combination (if it were even